

Policy Committee Meeting Minutes April 10, 2015 Council Chambers Room 115, City Hall

Policy Committee minutes are transcribed in a summarized outline manner. Audio recordings are on file with the City of Bloomington Planning & Transportation Department.

Attendance:

Policy Committee: Julie Thomas, Sarah Ryterband, Bill Williams, Richard Martin, Kent McDaniel, Cheryl Munson, Tony McClellan, Jason Banach, Mark Kruzan

Others: Rachel Bunn, Herald Times; Jerry Parkinson, Office of Joe Donnelly; Lew May, Bloomington Transit

MPO Staff: Josh Desmond, Anna Dragovich, Emily Avers

- I. Call to Order
- II. Approval of Minutes
 - A. March 6, 2015
Richard Martin moved for approval. Julie Thomas seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.
- III. Communications from the Chair
Kent McDaniel presented an update on public transit funding at the state level. The Senate Bill 379, which could have meant a huge increase in funding for Bloomington, died April 9th. There was another bill, Senate Bill 478, which would have had a minimal effect on public transportation corporations like Bloomington Transit, which also died April 9th. The Senate Appropriations Committee addressed the budget bill which included a very small- less than 1%- increase in funding for public transportation. The Senate Appropriations Committee cut the bill, so now it's a 3% reduction, which would have cost Bloomington Transit about \$75,000 if it had been implemented last year. It's not been a good year for public transit at the State House, but it's not over yet. There are still a couple of very slim chances the funding could get restored, but it does not look good.
- IV. Reports from Officers and/or Committees
 - A. Citizens Advisory Committee:
Sarah Ryterband said the CAC met and approved the TIP amendments that are being proposed. One question that was raised was what has happened to the IU/Bloomington Transit merger. She hopes McDaniel will come visit the CAC to let them know what is going on with the merger, She is particularly interested in this after hearing of the funding cuts that may be coming down the pike.

McDaniel will be out of town during the next CAC meeting, but he can come to the following meeting.

B. Technical Advisory Committee:

Desmond said the TAC had the same agenda presented today and they did vote to approve both the items on the agenda.

C. Report from I69:

Sandra Flum didn't have much to report. A lot of what's happening is now visible. Construction is happening, the trees have been removed for this year's construction season, the Rockport Road Bridge is coming up out of the ground and you can see the progress there, and the developer is maintaining St. Rd. 37 so you see their maintenance activities.

V. Reports from the MPO Staff

A. MTP Update:

Desmond provided a brief update. Since the March meeting we have developed a new 2035 LRTP from the existing 2030 LRTP as was decided at the March meeting. It has been posted on our website for the required 30 day public comment period prior to the May adoption meeting with the PC. We've submitted it to Federal Highway and to INDOT to get their feedback. We've heard a couple minor feedback items from INDOT at this point and we will continue to follow up with them to make sure we've covered all the bases in order for us to have a good valid plan to adopt in May. There will be a few changes and tweaks to what we've posted on the website before we bring the plan forward to you for adoption, but none of them will be drastic changes from what you see in the 2030 plan. We've updated some of the demographic projections, the financial projections, adjusted some of the project list to reflect things that are done or are no longer valid. These are very minor, basic changes. We did add one appendix to update the Safety Lou compliance appendix from the 2030 plan. We substituted a Map 21 compliance, since that is the current legislation that oversees all our planning efforts. Those are the changes you'll see if you go on to our website and download the plan. You will also get a copy of the final version we hope to adopt in your packet prior to our May meeting. In the meantime, we're working on getting the last of the bits and pieces for our travel demand model from the consultant. We have a tentative meeting set up for the end of April to have further training for staff, to get results from the multiple scenarios the consultant ran for us, as well as to get the technical documentation which will explain the steps we took to create the 2040 LRTP. A lot of good things are happening in the next few weeks. Hopefully by that time we'll have a lot of good data in our hands and we'll turn our focus to creating a good solid 2040 document for us to look at later this year.

McDaniel asked if there was any additional feedback from INDOT or FHwy.

Desmond said they've had the plan in their hands for about a week. He got an email couple days ago with some comments but he expects to hear more. If he doesn't hear back soon, he will be following up.

Martin said during the last meeting we discussed the Highway Safety Improvement Program funding and the fact we get more funds than we can use given the constraints we have. We talked about possibly contacting the state to see if some state projects could be done with our local funds since our highest incidents of traffic crashes are on state highways, not on local highways. Have you talked with them about that?

Desmond has not had a chance to ask. It's been his experience they don't typically allow locally allocated funds to be spent on state highway properties. He's not optimistic we would be allowed to, but he will follow up on that.

Martin said it seems senseless to send money back if there's a use for it. We certainly have the need on state highways. Maybe we're somewhat unique in that we have so many state highways where the crash rates are so high compared to other communities. In our area, if you look at the top ten crash sites, nine out of the ten are always state highways. If that would be something we could do to reduce the damage that's done in those areas, it would be good.

B. 3rd Quarter, FY 2015 Quarterly Tracking Report:

Dragovich presented a report of the 3rd Quarter Tracking Report. The Quarterly Tracking meetings are held at the end of every quarter so INDOT, the LPAs and the consultants to get together and discuss the projects. She provided the details that were provided to us at the last meeting and charted the information out as she usually does. She encouraged everyone to read through it before the meeting and ask her any questions. She doesn't want to go through every project, but if there are any items of concern, she would bring them to the PC's attention.

Martin had a question for Bill Williams about the Mount Tabor project. This project shows the most changes in funding amount. He wants to know why the project is changing so much.

Bill Williams said the project was bid on April 1st. Prices are going up. They started realizing that in November 2014 and adjusted the engineer's estimate for the project so it would be awardable up to \$2.5 million. There are no more STP funds available for this fiscal year and the bid came in \$300,000 over the \$2.5 estimate.

Martin asked if we were likely to see this as a continuing problem going forward.

Williams said with all our projects we'll be seeing the prices go up. The Mt. Tabor project should drop off because we did find enough match money for it.

VI. Old Business

VII. New Business

A. Self Certification*:

Desmond said this is just a simple housekeeping item we need to do on a regular basis. Basically, as part of our TIP and work program, we have to certify as an MPO that we're following all the rules and regulations set forth by the federal level in order to be a legal and valid functioning MPO. Every four years we go through a formal review process with FHWA and FTA and this is the year we're supposed to go through it again. We haven't been contacted yet to schedule that. It is our expectation that at some point before the end of the year we'll have a full review. In the meantime, we have to certify for this year that we are following all the rules and regulations that we are asked to follow as an MPO. This is a little more formal than we've done in years past. At the request of INDOT, we're doing a process modeled on what the Anderson MPO has done. We're bringing the self-certification statement to the Policy Committee for a formal endorsement so it's voted on and it's publicly viewable. All we're asking you to do today is to endorse this self-certification statement so we can sign it and submit it to INDOT as our next fiscal year's certification pending our formal certification from FHWA later this year.

Jason Banach said it looks like we're attesting to compliance with lots of provision of US Codes, the Civil Rights Act, the Clean Air Act, the Older American's Act, etc. Are we comfortable saying we are in compliance with this whole list of things?

Desmond said he is comfortable saying that. We've been found in compliance on a continuous basis in our formal reviews and we continue to maintain our programs, policies and procedures based on that. As far as he can say, we're fully in compliance.

There was no public comment.

Ryterband moved to endorse certification. Thomas seconded. Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

B. Transportation Improvement Program Amendments*

McDaniel proposed reviewing all the TIP amendments and having the discussion, public comment and vote done all at the same time. If there is an amendment someone doesn't like, then we can pull it out and deal with it individually.

Desmond said we are bringing forward 28 TIP amendments to bring FY years 2016 and 2017 of our existing TIP to match what is proposed for the fiscal years 2016- 2019 TIP. This is a defensive maneuver on our part to make sure our TIP has the latest information in it in the off chance we don't get our LRTP adopted in May and our TIP becomes frozen. We want to make sure we have the latest dollar amounts and funding sources identified for all of our projects so they can move forward and if something happens we have the right numbers in the to get the funding. He believes we will be on track to get the new LRTP adopted in May unless something drastic happens between now and then, so in one sense we'll adopt the LRTP and the 2016-2019 TIP in the same meeting, which will render what we're doing today

redundant. As we discussed before, we want to be defensive about it and make sure we're covered so we have a TIP that has the right information in it. That's why you see a list of 28 amendments. There were 32 amendments on the agenda, but there were 4 INDOT projects that were from this agenda even though the CAC and TAC voted and approved them. If an existing project is continuing forward without any changes, it is not included in this memo. We only included new projects and projects that are being amended in some way. There are projects still in the 2016 and 2017 TIP that are continuing forward without any changes at this time.

1. **Modify Karst Farm Greenway Phase 3 – Monroe County** : This is a modification to an existing project. This is to add some money for design funding, ROW funding and awarding a final amount of TAP funds for construction in Fiscal Year 2016

McDaniel said it would be better to discuss the amendments one at a time instead of at the end.

Martin said he was under the impression this is being awarded more TAP funding than we are allocated for a year. He thought the annual funding amount is around \$150,000.

Desmond said the funding amount for TAP is \$154,049. We are funding this project with that allocation, plus some of our older balance of TAP funds.

Martin clarified there is a carry over from a previous year that's being used. Where the memo says balance, it's taking whatever balance is left of the carry over, plus what is left from the year.

2. **Add Signal Back plates – Monroe County**: This was awarded HSIP funds at our last meeting. We're just formalizing that in the TIP.
3. **Add Woodlawn Railroad Crossing – City of Bloomington**: This is a new project for the City of Bloomington. It's a railroad crossing between 12th and 13th Sts. This is a project that the City and IU are working on in partnership. It is a city street, although IU initiated the project. Since it is a city street which will use some local federal funding from the MPO, it does need to be a city operated project. We're working out a legal agreement between the two entities where we'll manage the money and manage the project, but IU will end up fronting all the local funds for the project. The project will create a railroad crossing between 12th and 13th streets and connect it to the Woodlawn corridor that's being reconstructed between 13th and 17th St. right now.

Williams asked if this is construction funds. He asked if any activity has begun for the environmental study.

Desmond said design is done and they're about to start the environmental study. The project is in process. IU came to us for construction money well into the actual design process.

McDaniel said this is something he's been waiting on for years. It will provide a direct shot from the stadium parking lot into the center of campus. The plan includes pedestrian walk ways and bike paths.

Desmond said there has been one change from what is in the packet on this project. Since the memo was published, a situation came up where we had to push the ROW phase of the Old 37 and Dunn St project improvement into fiscal year 16 instead of 15, so we needed to find \$100,000 out of 2016 to fund that. That came out of the federal funds we had allotted for the Woodlawn Railroad Crossing. The actual dollar amount for the Woodlawn Railroad Crossing STP is now \$395,118. We've also changed the local match amount because we weren't showing the full project cost and we need to show that amount for any project we put federal funds to. We're only showing the local match for the federal funds. The full project cost is approximately \$1.7 million. Federal funding is going to be about \$400,000 of that and IU will be paying for the remainder of the local cost on that project. The final number should be \$395,118 for STP and \$1,304,0882 for local match for a total project cost of \$1.7 million. Related to that, the Old 37 and Dunn ROW phase will move from 2015 to 2016. It will still be \$100,000 STP and \$25,000 local, just one year later than we have it currently listed.

4. Add 17th Street Reconstruction – **City of Bloomington**: The next project is a new project that will be adding design and ROW funding in 2016 and 2017 for the 17th St corridor between where the new roundabout was just constructed at Monroe and Arlington and where the new overpass to Vernal Pike will be constructed. This will be reconstruction of the corridor in between those two new projects. You'll see the construction funds in the new TIP for 2019.
5. Add 2nd Street & College Avenue Signal Replacement – **City of Bloomington**: Construction money will be awarded for FY 2017.
6. Add Moore's Pike Guardrail – **City of Bloomington**: This was awarded HSIP funding for 2017 at last month's meeting. This is the guardrail project by Southeast Park.
7. Add Allen Street & Walnut Street Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon – **City of Bloomington**: This is another project which was awarded HSIP funding last month and will be added to the TIP for funding in 2017.
8. Add 4th Street & Rogers Street Pedestrian Island – **City of Bloomington**: This new project was awarded HSIP funding last month for 2017.
9. Add 3rd Street & Woodcrest Drive Signal Replacement – **City of Bloomington**: This is to upgrade the signaling technology and equipment. This will be awarded funds for 2017.

10. Add E. Rogers Road Sidepath – **City of Bloomington:** This side path will connect The Stands to Child's Elementary school. The funding will be awarded for the design phase in 2017.
11. Add South Henderson Sidepath – **City of Bloomington:** This side path was awarded TAP funding at last month's meeting for 2017 design, supplemented with STP funding. This side path will stretch from the Black Lumber Trail down to Winslow.
12. Add Winslow Road Sidepath – **City of Bloomington:** This will connect to the South Henderson Sidepath. It has been awarded STP funds for FY 2017 for the design stage.
13. **Modify** Tapp Road and Rockport Road Intersection – **City of Bloomington:** This project was being evaluated for a roundabout but for a little while now it has been decided to be a traditional intersection improvement. The change to this project is to remove the construction funding from 2017 because the project schedule has slipped a few months and that bumps it into FY 2018. We're not defunding the project; we're just moving the money to 2018 and you'll see that in the new TIP when it comes before you for approval next month.

Desmond added the draft of the new 2016-2019 TIP is posted on our website for the required public comment period. If you haven't seen it yet, go to our MPO website. It's out there for you to look at. Let us know what you think.

14. **Modify** Downtown Intersection Improvement – **City of Bloomington:** This will be to complete ADA improvements to some of the intersections downtown. The only change here is the project is moving from FY 2016 to FY 2017. It will still be an entirely HSIP funded project for the same dollar amount.
15. *Remove* Bikeways Projects – **City of Bloomington:** This set of bikeways projects will still occur, but will be done with only local funding, rather than federal funding. This will pay for a variety of on-street marking for bicycle facilities in various parts of the community.
16. **Modify** Operational Assistance – **Bloomington Transit:** Many of these projects are updates Lew May has provided on some of the existing numbers on the TIP. He's updated the 2016 and 2017 numbers to make sure we're accurate going forward with all the funding sources and expenditures that he intends to make for Bloomington Transit. There are some operational assistance updates.

Martin had questions about a couple of these items. The purchases of the 40 foot buses are marked for 3 buses to be purchased in 2015 and 2016, and then 4 in 2017. He wants to know how many buses will be purchased and when, particularly since the funding amount in 2017 doubled from the prior years'.

Lew May answered the question. Under the requested modification for 40 foot buses they would be purchasing 1 bus in 2014, 2015 would be 2, 2016 would be 4 and 2017 would be 7.

Martin we're essentially using the buses we already have longer and buying more at a later date for replacement or expansion.

May said in that is correct. He added that in FY 2017 they will be using 5309 funding. This is discretionary funds. That portion of the project is contingent on being able to access discretionary funds. The amount of discretionary grants has gone down greatly since the advent of Map 21, so they have no guarantees that portion of federal funds will be there.

Martin asked if that constitutes 3 buses.

May said that is correct.

Desmond said in 2016 and 2017 STP and STP balance are listed as funding sources for this item. Those sources are not traditionally used for this type of action, but under federal rules for funding there is the ability to flex money from STP, which is traditionally for road and infrastructure projects, to transit projects. Having a lack of road projects that are timed to use that funding and knowing we're in a use it or lose it situation with our money every year, we'd rather use it on something than lose it. This gives us a great opportunity to help out Lew with new buses in those years.

McDaniel said it is badly needed, too, since the loss of discretionary programs. He asked what the difference between STP and STP balance is.

Desmond said the STP balance is the carryover funding from prior years we need to spend down.

17. **Modify 40 Foot Buses Purchase – Bloomington Transit**

18. **Modify BT Access Vehicles – Bloomington Transit:** Martin said the modification has the same description but lacks a funding amount for 2017. Is that part of the description correct?

Desmond said that part of the description should be struck.

19. **Modify Maintenance Project – Bloomington Transit**

20. **Modify Passenger Shelter Project – Bloomington Transit:**

Martin said again this description hasn't changed but the funding changed years. This should be 6 more in 2017.

21. **Modify Support and Maintenance Vehicle Project – Bloomington Transit:** This is being moved up from FY 2017 to 2016.

22. **Modify Mobility Management Program – Bloomington Transit:** Desmond said Bloomington Transit has been helping to operate this program for the last several years. This funding is to continue into FY 2016 and 2017.

Martin asked if this is just to purchase more of the equipment in 2016 and 2017.

Desmond asked which item Martin is looking at.

Martin said the funding changed from 2014 only to 2014, 2016 and 2017. He's assuming more of the same equipment will be purchased.

May said the mobility management program is a project funded by FTA New Freedom funding. It's not a capital or equipment purchase. There are two elements to this program. It has a discounted taxi voucher program for people with disabilities who don't have access or are unable to use public transportation. There are accessible taxi services in Monroe County. This discounted taxi voucher program is in partnership with E2 Taxi. The program is already underway and has been for the past year or so. There is a second element to the project we call Mobility Management. Bloomington Transit is contracting with the Area 10 Agency on Aging to administer this program on BT's behalf. They're researching the development of volunteer driver programs to provide additional mobility for people with disabilities. Those programs have been successful in other areas of the country. Another project they will soon undertake is a consumer education program for people with disabilities to educate them on the transportation resources that are. This is not just public transportation, but also private transportation resources like taxis, shuttle buses and charter bus services.

Martin asked how they are funding this now, since there's no funding amount listed for the current funding year.

May said we have an obligated grant for this year.

23. Modify fare collection equipment- **Bloomington Transit:** Desmond said a fair amount of funding has been added to purchase new fare collecting equipment for FY 2017.

Martin asked why it would cost \$1.5 million to replace this equipment.

May said this is a great question. The \$1.2 million for FY 2017 is also to be funded from 5309 funding. It will only happen if BT is successful in getting discretionary funding for it. This is for the replacement of the entire fare collection system on all 38 buses, all 10 BT Access vehicles, as well as the data system that goes with it. Currently, we don't have swipe card capability on our buses. We don't even have currency verification or transfer printing capability on the buses or electronic vending machines at the Transit Center where someone could purchase a pass outside of business hours. This is quite expensive; it's about \$15,000 per bus to replace the equipment.

Martin said we'll be moving into the 21st Century.

- 24. Add Surveillance Equipment – **Bloomington Transit**
- 25. Add Fleet Maintenance Software – **Bloomington Transit**
- 26. Add Exhaust System Upgrade – **Bloomington Transit**
- 27. Add Bus Maintenance Project – **Rural Transit:**

Desmond said this is another case where we can flex some STP funds to Rural Transit for maintenance to their bus fleet.

Martin asked if there was a description for this.

Desmond said there should be. We will add the information from the application for that.

- 28. **Modify** I-69 Section 5 – **INDOT**: This updates some figures for the remaining expenses for Section 5 of I69.
- 29. Add Statewide Bridge Inspections – **INDOT**: These are the statewide projects for bridge inspections and consulting.

Desmond asked for any further questions. He reminded the Policy Committee the TAC and CAC both recommended approval of the amendments. They saw more amendments but did not see the changes for Woodlawn or Old 37 and Dunn.

Williams said a lot of this money has become available because of the change in years for the Rockport Rd/Tapp intersection and the \$200,000 from the bikeways project.

Desmond said FY 2017 saw a sudden influx of funding because of Rockport moving out. Otherwise, we'd be seeing a lot of projects for 2018 instead of 2017.

Williams said he wishes he'd brought his project list in sooner. The environmental study on Fullerton Pike has been completed, but it was after this process had already started. His laundry list of project is short, but it's all large projects. He asked what the fiscal impact will be on the side path projects when they come to construction. What are those projects going to do to large projects like 17th St, Rockport Rd, Tapp and Fullerton, that are already in the TIP.

Desmond said a lot of the side path projects will not come to construction until beyond 2019. We'll have to commit to some construction dollars in future TIPS on those things. If we're starting design in FY 2017 on these projects, it won't impact dollars we set aside for construction in 2018 or 2019. We've accommodated some ROW in those years for some of those projects, but the construction won't happen until later than the existing projects in the pipeline. They will have an impact in those later years. If we're committing to starting a project now and finishing it later, we're going to have to pay for that and we'll have to make some different choices in those later years.

Williams said Fullerton Pike is definitely a multi-phase project as is listed in the Long Range Transportation Plan. That's another question. Are these projects justified in the plan we're operating on now?

Desmond said he thinks so, especially the bike/ped. plans that are in the LRTP right now. There are fairly extensive plans for bike/ped. projects in the LRTP and he thinks they will be justified.

Martin said that was his comment at the last meeting. Many of these projects commit a lot of STP funds well into the future. He took it at Desmond's word that most of these projects don't start seriously until 2017, by which time we'll have another MTP and we can essentially rearrange all of these at that point in time given what priorities come out of that MTP. These projects may or may not stay in this plan as a result of the MTP. That's happened before, that we've kicked things down the road or removed them. That's just part of the process. He believes Desmond is correct that as the plan stands currently, these are supported projects and many of the other projects weren't in the plan because there wasn't a need for them at the time the plan was originally done. As the needs change, we'll be able to change the priorities for some of these projects.

Williams said his concern is that the interstate will be constructed and in operation by the end of 2016 and we have a lot of road projects that need to be tied in that we need to be considering. Starting some other, newer projects like these is a little worrisome from a fiscal standpoint.

Desmond said we can adopt this today, but we're not adopting the new TIP for a month. We can adopt something that's different from what you see today even a month from now, if there's something urgent you think we need to take another look at before we adopt that TIP. Let's talk some more if there's something you think is a huge priority that we need to reconsider before May comes around and we adopt the new TIP.

Munson commented about the Tapp Rd/Rockport Rd intersection. This has been on the horizon for quite a while and now it's being kicked down the road. Is there ever a chance that a project can be kicked up the road?

Desmond said it's rare. We usually deal with delays instead of efficiencies.

Munson said that's what she thought. This moves construction of that intersection into 2018.

Desmond said FY 2018 starts July 1, 2017. The letting date for this project is in August. It could let that summer and even begin construction that summer and fall.

Munson said it's essentially delaying the construction for one year, correct?

Desmond said not really. The letting date was going to be in the spring of 2017 and now it's going to be later in the summer of 2017, which means it crosses the fiscal year line. It's really only delaying the construction letting by a few months even though it looks like it's going from year to year.

Munson said with I69, Rockport will become a much more important artery for the southwest part of the county and Bloomington. She didn't want to see this delayed.

Desmond said we're working hard on this because it's a big project.

***Martin made a motion to approve the memorandum concerning the TIP amendments for all the 28 projects identified in the memo except item 4 and item 27, with the following modifications to the 26 projects being approved in the motion:

1. To correct the funding for the Woodlawn Railroad Crossing to show 2016 STP funds of \$395,118 and local match funds of \$1,304,882 for a total of \$1.7 million
2. To add the project at Old 37 and Dunn, moving the ROW for 2015 to 2016 in the amount of \$100,000 from STP and \$25,000 from local match
3. To add to the description for item 17 that we will be purchasing 1 40 foot bus in 2014, 2 in 2015, 4 in 2016 and 7 in 2017
4. That we modify the description for item 18 to remove the last clause which says to add 2 2012 BT Access vans in 2017 since we've pushed that out
5. Correct the description for item 20 so it reads 6 new shelter benches in 2014 and 6 more in 2017
6. Add for item 26 a description of this project to be taken from the application from Rural Transit.

McDaniel said if we pass Martin's motion, it does not mean we have rejected number 4 and number 27. We can deal with those in another motion. We can clean this up and get those out of the way and then deal with the other two if someone wants to second the motion.

Ryterband seconded the motion.

Banach asked if we needed an amendment like this in writing.

McDaniel said we have not done that in the past and we have dealt with some pretty difficult adjustments. He asked if Desmond had all the information to make the necessary changes.

Desmond said it is everything we discussed today minus the two items Martin called out.

There was no public comment.

***Motion passed through unanimous voice vote.

Martin explained why he excluded the two projects. Having gone through an extended effort to try to understand Sections 4 and 5 of I69, having sat through many discussion with INDOT and FHA to discuss I69 and how we are going to pay for the local projects that were going to be made necessary as a result of this, it's his feeling that those negotiations, while they didn't get codified sufficiently, should have included several projects of local interest that were going to be made necessary by I69 and that the funding for I69 should then include those projects. He understands there are constraints INDOT has about the scope of the project area, but the failure of INDOT to provide extra funding in addition to what they normally provide to cover those projects is the reason he's going to vote no to these two projects. We need more money to do these kind of projects. Williams has talked about other projects we're going to need. We have two others we know we're going to have to do that are both more expensive than the 17th St project and to do them properly we're either going to take all the money we have to solve those I69 related problems or INDOT's going to have to find more money to give us to solve those problems. They're problems INDOT has created and is imposing on this community and he doesn't think it's a reasonable thing for us to support. We have to provide some push-back to say it's time you step up to the plate and meet your obligations because that is what you owe us as a result of the discussions we had earlier.

Thomas asked he clarify the items he wishes to remove.

Martin said they are the 17th St. reconstruction, not that it's not a valid project, and the I69 Section 5 amendment to add funding in 2016 and 2017. He doesn't think it will stop either of those projects at this time, but he thinks it's necessary for us to say the state has to find more money for us to fund that kind of project. He doesn't know any other way to do it.

Desmond said they've approved a motion adopting everything except those two items. As it stands right now, they are excluded. Are you now going to make a motion to approve those two items and then vote against it?

McDaniel said it didn't sound like a motion. We're just discussing at this point.

Munson said the 17th St. project has ROW and engineering covered in this presentation, but it doesn't say construction costs. What are the estimated construction costs?

Mark Kruzan asked a procedural question. What are we talking about? We already voted on this. Why are we having a discussion after the vote? We voted to approve

without those projects. Then a non-motion was seconded and now we're discussing a vote that already occurred.

Desmond said we're waiting on a second motion.

McDaniel said there's no motion on the table so this is just a discussion of what we want to do with those two projects that we did not deal with yet.

Kruzan asked under what order of business we're discussing them.

McDaniel said this is still under TIP amendments.

Kruzan said we just approved that item without these amendments.

McDaniel said we approved 26 of the amendments to the TIP. We have not yet dealt with these two.

****Kruzan moved to add those projects back in.**

Kruzan said we're jeopardizing those two projects to make a point that most of us have argued all along. If we were going to fight that fight it needed to be fought back when the approvals were given for I69. We're now going to try to relive the entire history of I69 at the expense of a W 17th St project and all the neighbors who are concerned about access, the safety issue. He gets it, these are the exact same arguments he was making at the time, that all of us were making, that the peripheral expense of the interstate was going to be borne by the community. He was asking the Chamber of Commerce and all their members and INDOT how they were going to fund all these peripheral projects. Who is going to bear the cost of that? That was never answered, but he doesn't know that now is the time to try to leverage that.

Martin said that's why he's not supporting the I69 amendments either.

Kruzan said every one of us has the right to do that. He's simply saying the project has gone along, it's been approved, the interstate is being built and to threaten these projects now just doesn't strike him as prudent. He understands there may not be a second to his motion.

Martin said he understands there is a difference in opinion in how to do that.

*****Tony McClellan seconded.**

Banach said the Mayor makes a good point and he agrees.

Kruzan said he completely understands what Martin is doing. This is an argument he and many others, the activists in the community, council member Ruff, the members of the MPO Policy Committee, all shared in objection to I69. It wasn't just the environmental impact or the property rights impact, it was also because of the impact on the community and who was going to pay for the ripple effect of the interstate and we never got an answer. But we are where we are and he hopes that people will continue to put pressure on INDOT to come forward with that funding. He just doesn't want to do it at the expense of public safety on W 17th St or other projects. He doesn't disagree with the spirit, he just disagrees with the strategy at this time.

Munson added she drives 17th St daily and there is great risk to pedestrians. Every time she sees Susie Johnson she brings it up. This is one of the top projects.

Martin is aware of the need, but he knows of no other way to get their attention other than to say no.

Kruzan said he hopes we just got INDOT's attention. He thinks there are other ways to try to do that.

Martin said he hasn't seen any of the other ways be successful yet, so he's trying a different one.

Kruzan said voting against the interstate wasn't successful either, and he was one of the people who did that, so he understands the frustration.

Munson said she wants a point of clarification. We just passed 26 amendments. If we don't modify Section 5, it will stay as it currently is in the TIP?

Desmond said that is correct.

Munson said we really aren't doing much with that. The 17th St project was a new project moved into the TIP.

Desmond said that is correct.

Munson said the final vote on the TIP is next meeting. So there is time within the next month for discussion with INDOT about additional funding.

Desmond said that is correct.

McDaniel asked for any other comments from the Committee.

McDaniel opened the floor for public comment.

Flum said she thinks there are a couple pieces of information missing from this conversation. There were projects that we committed to partner with the community on back when the Section 5 project was put into the TIP. INDOT met with the county a couple times, came up with a proposal of how to help partner and how to find funding money. That conversation stalled, but there was conversation. She doesn't know the status of that at this point, but it's not been progressing. Likewise, we met with the city about 17th St. There were some things that happened in the Engineering office that they were focused on and they did not come back. In the meantime, in the last couple weeks, Tom Micuda has asked for an additional meeting. We've just not been able to sync up calendars yet to re-engage in that discussion about 17th St and the partnering. She knows there was the question of the railroad crossing on the west side of 37, but she doesn't remember the other projects that are related in the MPO area.

Martin said we know these are projects we'll have to do but we need more money to do them. He thinks INDOT has an obligation to provide the money.

Flum said she remembers Jim Starks saying we're happy to partner with you and he knows he has been in the meetings with both the county and the city at various times over the past year. He wanted to add that information to this discussion so you know we have not abandoned the partnership and we are continuing to be open to conversation. The county and the city have not moved quickly.

Williams said they did have several discussions with Mr. Stark. They found out the definition of partnering was for the county to take over the majority of INDOT's 2-lane roadway segments here in Monroe County, which we could not afford in exchange for some federal aid credits. For the safety of the public, it was not workable for us to even pretend we could maintain the roadways to the same standard they're being maintained to today.

McDaniel asked for a roll call.

Banach asked to clarify what we are voting on.

McDaniel said to add items 4 and 27 and amending them into the TIP as presented by staff.

**Roll was taken; motion failed 5:4.

VIII. Communications from Committee Members (*non-agenda items*)

A. Topic Suggestions for Future Agendas: None at this time.

IX. Upcoming Meetings

- A. Technical Advisory Committee – April 29 at 10:00 a.m. (McCloskey Room)
- B. Citizens Advisory Committee – April 29 at 6:30 p.m. (McCloskey Room)



Bloomington/Monroe County Metropolitan Planning Organization
Policy Committee

C. Policy Committee – May 8 at 1:30 p.m. (Council Chambers)

Adjournment

**Action Requested / Public comment prior to vote (limited to five minutes per speaker)*

These minutes were adopted by the Policy Committee at their meeting held on May 8, 2015 (EJEA).